

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 18-1810

GREGORY H. SUTTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOMERSET COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION; JOHN GADDIS, In his
official and individual capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Ellen L. Hollander, District Judge. (1:17-cv-00504-ELH)

Submitted: February 28, 2019

Decided: March 7, 2019

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robin R. Cockey, Ashley A. Bosché, COCKEY, BRENNAN & MALONEY, PC,
Salisbury, Maryland, for Appellant. Lisa Y. Settles, Adam E. Konstas, PESSIN KATZ
LAW, P.A., Towson, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gregory H. Sutton appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Somerset County Board of Education ("the Board") and its Superintendent of Schools John Gaddis (collectively, "Appellees"), in Sutton's action alleging race discrimination pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012), and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983 (2012). We affirm.

On appeal, Sutton contends that summary judgment was improper because a reasonable juror could conclude that the given reasons for Sutton's termination were pretextual. "We review a district court's decision to grant summary judgment de novo, applying the same legal standards as the district court and viewing all facts and reasonable inferences therefrom in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party." *Grutzmacher v. Howard Cty.*, 851 F.3d 332, 341 (4th Cir.) (internal quotation marks omitted), *cert. denied*, 138 S. Ct. 171 (2017). Summary judgment is appropriate "if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a).

Our review of the record leads us to conclude that the district court did not err in granting summary judgment to Appellees. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Sutton v. Somerset Cty. Bd. of Educ.*, No. 1:17-cv-00504-ELH (D. Md. June 19, 2018). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED